



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nor was Mr. Carnegie the first to suggest one. But the peculiarity of his proposal, that the League be backed by the boycott and provision for the ultimate use of violence to maintain peace, lays it open to most serious criticism. Indeed, this feature of what he proposes is in radical contradiction of his assertion earlier in his St. Andrew's address, that this reform must be carried through in dependence on moral forces only. It is certain in advance that neither three nor five of the great powers can ever be induced to enter into such a league. The arrangement of the forces, particularly the land forces, situated at such wide distances from each other, would be practically impossible. The League, unless practically all the first-class powers joined it, would require keeping up the great armaments, with all the suspicions and jealousies arising from them. There is no doubt, as Ex-Ambassador White thinks, that such a league would almost inevitably lead to even greater wars than those sought to be avoided. It would almost certainly, as the Holy Alliance proves, lead to abuse and highhandedness, and in the name of peace the great league would probably be the destruction of most or all of the small powers. Even the boycott, which might conceivably be tolerated, is of entirely too uncertain a character to be incorporated into a great scheme of peace.

But a peace league, pure and simple, without any provision or even hint of force, ought at this late day to be entirely practicable. If five of the great powers would enter into a simple agreement that they would never again go to war with each other, that they would settle all their differences through the Hague Court, and would faithfully use their good offices toward peace among the other nations, they could unquestionably, without a cannon or a warship, control the world. The example would be irresistible. The other nations would hasten to join them. The present time, so soon after the gigantic war just ended, is an opportune moment to move for such a league. It is known that China and Japan would be entirely willing to federate themselves in a pacific way with the Western nations. The United States, Great Britain, France, Italy — is there any reasonable doubt that all these powers, if properly approached by some wise and forceful leader, would be ready to enter into a peace pact of this nature? — and Switzerland, Belgium, The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Mexico, Chile, the Argentine Republic, could all be counted on. Russia, when through her chaos and finally reconstructed, would not stay a day out of the fold. The moral weight of such a federation, once inaugurated, would overwhelm any people holding itself aloof, and war would at last be rendered impossible.

If Mr. Carnegie can find a leader, a man (or a group of men) who will take upon himself the high task of summoning the nations to undertake the con-

stitution of such a league of peace, as Mr. Roosevelt summoned Russia and Japan to end their sanguinary conflict, he might expect to live to see war abolished at a stroke. But if there is no such leader — and where shall we find him? — then we must be content to see the great problem worked out by the slower processes of Hague Conferences, ordinary arbitration treaties and the like.

Premier Balfour's Prophecy of Peace.

Nothing could be more indicative of the wonderful change that has come to the world in regard to the relations of the nations to each other than the utterance of Mr. Balfour, the British Prime Minister, at the Lord Mayor's banquet in the Guild Hall, London, on the evening of November 9. He began by saying, as reported, "A century ago Pitt, standing where I now stand, prophesied war: to-day I prophesy peace."

The significance of this remarkable utterance, made in the presence of many ambassadors and ministers from other nations, does not lie chiefly in the fact that it came from the Premier of a great and mighty nation, nor in the further fact that it was put in the form of a prophecy. In the strict sense of the term it was not a prophecy at all. It was simply an intelligent interpretation and forecast of the results of the new spirit and the new forces now working, before everybody's eyes, so powerfully and incessantly in the field of international relations. The same thing, in substance, has been said hundreds of times, in the last five or six years, by thoughtful men both in and out of public life. The settled peace of the nations cannot much longer be delayed. In fact, it is just at the door.

The new direction which the world is taking, in spite of its old bad habits and senseless prejudices, has become so manifest of late that the responsible leaders of even the most powerful and self-contained nations have been compelled, *volens volens*, to recognize it and in some measure to fall in with it. This is what gives Mr. Balfour's declaration, however spontaneous and sincere it may have been, its immense meaning and weight. All the other prime ministers of the world, who have not already done so, will be obliged very soon to make the same confession and to range themselves on the side of those who prophesy peace and seek at the same time, in some measure at least, to assure the fulfillment of their own predictions.

Mr. Balfour had primary reference, no doubt, to the relations of his own country to the rest of the world. He was dealing with British foreign policy, and was bold to say that he saw no war cloud, nor any sign of one, on Britain's horizon. But his prediction took necessarily, in the presence of the distinguished foreign guests present, a wider scope. He said, as reported: "I am sanguine on this subject. I think in the future we shall not see war, unless

indeed we can conceive of a nation or a ruler arising who will be unable to carry out a scheme of national aggrandizement except through trampling on the rights of his neighbors. However, I see no prospect of such a calamity in Europe."

Mr. Balfour's references to Russia were thoroughly in harmony with the general tenor of his remarks. There was not, so far as the press dispatches indicate, a nagging word in what he said. He declared that for years past the British government had done everything possible to ward off the danger of war. The truth of this statement, in a general way at least, is borne out by the action of the British Cabinet at the time of the North Sea incident, and of other happenings during the course of the Russo-Japanese war. More significant still, if possible, was the manner of his speech in regard to the present internal upheaval in Russia. There was no side-thrusting, no taunting and reproaching. He expressed the sincere wish, on the part of the British government and people, that the Emperor and his advisers, in the difficult task which they had undertaken of giving the Russian people self-government, might meet with every success.

The whole speech, so far as we are able to judge from the meagre reports cabled over, was the speech of a peacemaker. The sentiments were such as one is accustomed to hear in peace circles, and when diplomatic gatherings, presided over by prime ministers, are turned into veritable peace meetings, there is indeed encouragement to believe that the era of goodwill and peace among the nations is not far off. At any rate, such language as that used at this Lord Mayor's banquet by the British Premier and powerfully supported by the United States ambassador and other prominent foreign officials, however much of it some may be inclined to set down to after-dinner gush and diplomatic palaver, will do much to allay prejudices and ill-feelings, to create an international atmosphere of peace, and thus to bring about the very conditions on which the structure of permanent peace must rest.

Talk and prophecy of war have often, as is well known, helped to bring on war in the past. It was so in Pitt's day, and has often been so since. Prophecy of peace is just as sure to pave the way for peace. It will not at once stop all preparations for war, or immediately cure the governments of their strange inconsistencies and their petty meannesses abroad, but it will lessen friction, create stronger confidence and respect, make the directors of foreign policies more careful to avoid reckless and irritating proceedings, and thus contribute materially toward undermining the spirit out of which war and armaments spring. There has been not a little in the conduct of the British government within the past few years to make Mr. Balfour's prophecy sound much like hollow pretense. But even so, to talk as he did in the hearing

of the world, — sincerely, as we believe, — was infinitely better than if he had followed the example of Pitt and predicted war. The British navy is much more likely at an early date to cease growing under peace prophecies than under predictions of war and fighting.

Canadian Militarism.

If there is any section of the world less in need of an army and navy than any other, it is Canada. A treaty between the United States and Great Britain has kept the Great Lakes free from armed vessels and the border from frowning fortresses since 1818, and Canada thus enjoys the greatest security so far as our country is concerned. On both sides the wide oceans are her bulwarks. In other respects not a solitary reason can be found why the Dominion should suddenly plunge into the foaming swirl of militarism. But that is exactly what she is permitting herself foolishly to do, under an evil inspiration from over sea.

The imperial garrisons at Halifax and Esquimaux are being replaced by Canadian troops. But this is not the worst. Measures are being taken for the organization of a large standing army, comparatively at least, and the building of a Canadian navy. The size of the proposed navy is not yet revealed, but it is planned to place a squadron of vessels on the Atlantic coast and another on the Pacific. The new army, the plans for which have been arranged by Lord Dundonald, will comprise a total force of 200,000 men, half of whom will be regulars and half volunteers. Of the regulars, 60,000 will be enrolled and trained for war alone, and 40,000 for both war and peace. One-third of the 100,000 will always be with the colors. Comparatively, this will make the Canadian army much larger than that of the United States, our army at its maximum having only 100,000 men, and at its minimum 60,000.

The purpose of this new departure, which has evidently been brought about from London, is said to be for the general aid of the whole British Empire, that Great Britain may have the immediate use of all her soldiers hitherto stationed in Canada, and may be able in time of emergency to draw upon Canada for contingents of disciplined troops. From the point of view of the British imperialists and army and navy promoters this is a shrewd scheme. It makes Canada more independent in a way, but puts her under new bonds to the Empire, and inducts her into a system the mischiefs of which will be of several sorts, all about equally serious.

In the first place, it will lay a heavy burden financially on the eight millions of Canadians. When the army scheme is in full operation it will, judging from our own national military experiences, cost the Dominion not less than fifty million dollars a year,